

**Santa Barbara City College
College Planning Council
Tuesday, November 15, 2011
2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.
A218C
Minutes**

PRESENT:

J. Friedlander, (Chair), Acting
Superintendent/President
I. Alarcón, Past-Pres., Academic Senate;
O. Arellano, VP, Continuing Education;
L. Auchincloss, Pres., CSEA;
P. Bishop, VP Information Technology;
S. Ehrlich, VP HR &LA
R. Else, Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research &
Planning;
J. Englert, ASB President;

M. Guillen, Classified Staff Rep;
K. Monda, Academic Senate Representative,
Chair Planning and Resources Committee;
K. Neufeld, VP, Academic Senate Rep;
D. Nevins, Academic Senate President;
K. O'Connor, Academic Senate Representative;
C. Salazar, Classified Staff Representative
M. Spaventa, Executive VP Ed Programs;
J. Sullivan, VP Business Services

ABSENT:

GUESTS:

C. Alsheimer, Instructors' Association (IA)
R. Byrne, Dir. Athletics
B. Partee, Dean, Education Programs,

L. Stark, Pres. IA
J. Tibbetts, Student Senate

Acting Superintendent/President Friedlander called the meeting to order.

1. Dr. Friedlander clarified that the Budget Reduction Target for 2013 – 14 is 8.7%. and not 8.2%.
2. Approval of the minutes of October 18, 2011 meeting and the November 1, 2011 meeting.

M/S/C [Guillen/Salazar] to approve the minutes of the October 18, 2011 CPC Meeting. All in favor.

M/S/C [Guillen/ Salazar] to approve the minutes of the November 1, 2011 CPC Meeting. All in favor.

Announcements/Additions to the Agenda

1. Dr. Friedlander stated that the following are information items providing an opportunity for questions if needed.

- a. The findings and recommendations of the ACCJC November 9 and 10 site visit will be sent to the college in January 2012.
- b. Media Conference to announce expanded guaranteed articulation agreement between SBCC and Antioch University Santa Barbara (AUSB) and AUSB's Bridge Program will take place on Wednesday, November 16, 2011 at 10:30am in the Luria Conference and Press Center. Students will be able to complete their first three years of AUSB's bachelor degree requirements at SBCC.
- c. Changes that have been made to the recommendations of the Student Success Task Force (SSTF) that will be sent in December to the Board of Governors. (Att. 3 & 4)
- d. The state's revenues for the first four months of its fiscal year (2011-12) are significantly under what was projected. If revenue shortfalls continue in November and December, the criteria for implementing the Tier 1 and Tier 2 mid-year budget cuts will be met. (Att. 5)
- e. Revised Program Review Timeline that was reviewed at the October 18, 2011 CPC meeting. (Att. 6)

Budget Items

1. Review of timeline for developing the college budget for 2012-13.

VP Sullivan went through the timeline making a few changes that were noted and discussed how the information will be disseminated.

There was discussion and consensus on the fact that the President will send out a campus-wide email summarizing the college's approach to the budget reductions. The email will include information regarding the budget reduction worksheets and the need to reduce the college budget by 8.7% in the next two years. Meeting this budget target will require making significant reductions in operational costs in addition to the \$2M in instructional expenditures that will be cut. Dr. Monda suggested that in the email it is mentioned that we want everyone to participate since this is a new process for the college this year where we have a chance to work together to make these budget reductions. and that we are not the only college cutting programs. Dr. Friedlander stated that he will discuss the content of the email with the Executive Council prior to sending it to the campus community.

2. The budget reduction spreadsheets for identifying items that would need to be cut/eliminated in 2012-13 and in 2013-14 to achieve the 8.7% budget reduction target by 2013-14.
 - a. Spreadsheets will be sent to VP's and departments by December 8, 2011.
 - b. Proposed due date to submit budget reductions to area VPs is February 10, 2012.
 - c. CPC will begin its review and ranking of the budget cuts and their implications at its March 6, 2012 meeting.

Dr. Friedlander stated that the Executive Committee is recommending that Departments will need to target 60% of the 8.7% reduction next year and the balance of the reductions (40%) in 2013-14.

3. Proposed formation of Budget Review Work Group.

a. Purpose of Budget Review Work Group

Dr. Friedlander stated that the charge of the workgroup will be to identify and assess the feasibility of strategies that will result in significant budget reductions to present to CPC for achieving the college's budget reduction target. The idea is to have a small workgroup of members from CPC to look more deeply at what the ramifications are for the college and bring the ideas back to CPC.

b. Proposed membership of the work group

VP Sullivan stated that the proposed members of this work group would include the Academic Senate President; IA Representative; CSEA/CCG Representative; Acting Exec VP; VP, CE; and VP Business Affairs. The P & R Chair will be attending the first meeting to see if this meeting can fit into her schedule of teaching, correcting papers, and participating in P&R meetings.

There was further discussion regarding the details of this group. VP, Business Affairs Sullivan stated that the workgroup will be creating an independent evaluation to look at the numbers and resources and to look at the overall picture of the college, what the issues are around recommendations, and delve into it to make a good recommendation. This is an important task and will take time.

There was consensus that this group be formed.

c. Next steps.

Dr. Friedlander stated that he will convene the meeting where they will clarify the charge more carefully. Dr. Friedlander recommended that the Chair of the Work Group be VP Sullivan as his main focus is the budget and he has access to all the necessary information.

4. Review of Program Review and non-routine resource requests recommended for funding in 2011-12.

VP Sullivan projected on the screen the Program Review and Non-routine Resource Request lists recommended for funding in 2011-12 and went through what was taken out and what was left on the list. The total amount of additional funds needed to pay for the recommended resource requests on these spreadsheets will be taken to the December 15 Regular Board Meeting to be voted on for approval.

It was clarified that the P & R and the ITC lists matched the Executive Committee's list so that things that had not been ranked were not funded.

Dr. Friedlander and VP Business Sullivan discussed different items that had been taken off the list, and will be taken off the list, confirmed that \$1.3M is in the adopted budget, and stated that the gap in funding in that is in the 2011-12 budget and the additional amount needed to pay for the recommended resource requests is what the board will be asked to approve at its December 15, 2011 meeting. It was clarified that there is a separate line item in the budget, \$324,000, to pay for non-routine items.

- a. Amount of money needed to fund resources ranked last year to be funded in 2011-12 and the sources of funds to pay for these items.
 - b. Identification of amount of additional money to allocate to fund the resource requests beyond what was included in this year's college budget.
 - c. Process to identify items ranked to be funded in 2011-12 that will not be funded.
5. Review of proposed edits to BP 6251 Principles of Budget Development. (Att. 8)
Dr. Friedlander stated that the attached Principles of Budget Development is a copy using "track changes". This item will be placed on our next agenda for discussion.

College Plan: 2012-14

1. Complete review of the College Plan: 2012-14 (Att. 9)
Executive VP Spaventa reported that the College Plan was discussed at length at Dean's Council and there was consensus that Goal 1 is not ready to go forward and they would like more time in Dean's Council to work on refining the objectives.

Dr. Friedlander stated that the Institutional Effectiveness Report contains many more outcome measures that is included the Accountability Reporting for the Community Colleges (ARCC) Measures. Do we want the College Plan to correspond to the Institutional Effectiveness Report that we use or do we want to make the plan much narrower and focus on the ARCC outcomes as it pertains to College Plan, Goal 1? Or does the College Plan just focus on a portion of what is in the Institutional Effectiveness Report which is the ARCC Measures?

The discussion continued regarding what the best approach would be to take in developing the College Plan. Acting EVP Spaventa stated that the Deans felt that they would rather focus on the major objectives than listing all those that can be reached through the many tactical plans.

There was more conversation about simplifying the College Plan with fewer numbers and percentages and coming to a decision about what is a reasonable target to reach taking into account the effects that the budget cuts may have on their attainment.

Dr. Friedlander stated that in the end the California State Legislature is expecting the California Community Colleges to do better regardless of the budget cuts. With the State and Federal governments, it is all a matter of: “what are we getting for our money’s worth” in higher education. The College’s goals include increasing its transfer rates and the percentage of students that are prepared for and secure jobs that pay competitive wages. These goals are in line with the highest priorities for the state and federal governments.

Dr. Friedlander summed up the conversation with the question: “In in this economic environment, do we continue to make modest improvements or is it totally unreasonable to expect us to do more than hold our own?” In other word, is the status quo a good goal or is a 2 or 3% increase over a three year period an achievable goal for most of the objectives?

Sr. Dir. Inst. Assessment, Research & Planning Else suggested retrieving data by going to the historic years and look at the trend lines of each of these data points over the years, look at where the objectives we laid out are going and then have a visual feel of whether these are aggressive or conservative goals and perhaps this would be easier to evaluate.

Further discussion took place regarding cutting the number of objectives, communicating with faculty about what we are trying to achieve, capturing the effect of the budget cuts on our institution, tracking budget reduction to success, and tracking transferring to four-year institutions.

Dr. Friedlander closed the discussion saying that we will continue the review of the goals and objectives to include in the College Plan: 201214 at the next CPC meeting.

Discussion Items:

Further discussion took place regarding the JPA (Joint Powers Authority) Self-Insurance Plan:

- a. In summary, VP Sullivan answered questions regarding the JPA stating that the Board of Trustees authorize the movement of the funds and 30 days later we receive the money. There are no penalty or accounting fees. The fund does earn money at the same rate the college’s other funds make. \$1M needs to stay in the account.

Dr. Friedlander stated that at the next CPC meeting the following will be finalized:

1. As mentioned earlier in the meeting, the College Plan-2012-2014;
2. The BP 6251: Principles of Budget Development; and
3. The Program Review and Non-Routine Resource Requests will be sorted out, with budget numbers assigned.

Dr. Friedlander asked for a motion to adjourn.

M/S/C [Nevins/Kenley] to adjourn the meeting.

Next CPC Meeting: Tuesday, December 6, 2011, 2:30 p.m. – 4:30 p.m.